



02-24-06

IPW

# MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP

1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226      2402 Michelson Drive, Suite 210  
 San Jose, CA 95110      Irvine, CA 92612  
 Tel. (408) 392-9250      Tel. (949) 752-7040  
 Fax (408) 392-9262      Fax (949) 752-7049  
 Email: [mailbox@macpherson-kwok.com](mailto:mailbox@macpherson-kwok.com)  
[www.macpherson-kwok.com](http://www.macpherson-kwok.com)

February 22, 2006

Mail Stop Amendment  
 Commissioner For Patents  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re:      Applicant:      Oleg Siniaguine  
 Assignee:      Tru-Si Technologies, Inc.  
 Title:      Plasma Processing Comprising Three Rotational Motions Of An Article Being Processed  
 Serial No.:      10/627,038      Filed:      July 24, 2003  
 Examiner:      Arancibia, Maureen Gramaglia      Group Art Unit: 1763  
 Docket No.:      M-7554-1D US

Dear Sir:

Transmitted herewith are the following documents in the above-identified application:  
 (1) Return Receipt Postcard;  
 (2) This Transmittal Letter (1 page in duplicate);  
 (3) Amendment (6 pages); and  
 (4) Applicants' Record of Substance of Interview (MPEP 713.04) (3 pages).

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

### CLAIMS AS AMENDED

	Claims Remaining <u>After Amendment</u>		Highest No. <u>Previously Paid For</u>		Present <u>Extra</u>			Additional Fee
Total Claims	9	Minus	20	=	0	x \$50.00	\$	0.00
Independent Claims	1	Minus	3	=	0	x \$200.00	\$	0.00
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fee of _____ for the first filing of one or more multiple dependent claims per application						\$	

### Total additional fee for this Amendment:      \$

Conditional Petition for Extension of Time: If an extension of time is required for timely filing of the enclosed document(s) after all papers filed with this transmittal have been considered, an extension of time is hereby requested.

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2257 in the amount of      \$      0.00

Also, charge any additional fees required and credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-2257

**Total:**      \$      0.00

**EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:**

**EV 861 968 917 US**

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael Shenker*

Michael Shenker  
 Attorney for Applicants  
 Reg. No. 34,250



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/627,038      Filing Date: July 24, 2003  
Confirmation No.: 3735  
First Named Inventor: Oleg Siniaguine  
Assignee: Tru-Si Technologies, Inc.  
Examiner: Arancibia, Maureen      Art Unit: 1763  
Gramaglia  
Attorney Docket No.: M-7554-1D US

---

San Jose, California  
February 22, 2006

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPLICANTS' RECORD OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW (MPEP 713.04)**

Dear Sir:

This is a record of the substance of the telephone interview between Examiners Maureen Arancibia and Parviz Hassanzadeh and the undersigned held on February 14, 2004 regarding the Office Action dated December 27, 2005.

1. With respect to the 35 USC 112 rejection, the undersigned suggested deleting the words "non-contact" in Claim 2 and reciting that the article holder has a body which emits one or more gas flows towards the article to develop vacuum to hold the wafer adjacent to the body, the one or more gas flows preventing the article from contacting the body. The undersigned stated that such amendment was supported by the specification, page 9, last paragraph, and page 12, line 25 ("non-contact" holder). Examiner Arancibia stated that the undersigned should indicate the support for the amendment in his remarks in response to the Office Action as the examiner would study the amendment to determine if it was supported.

2. Regarding the section 103 rejection, the undersigned had received from Examiner Arancibia an English translation of the Japanese reference (Hiuga) by fax. The undersigned stated that there was no indication that the Japanese reference taught wafer rotation by pins 12. Pins 12 rotated in order to position the pieces 13 underneath the wafer 11 (Fig. 4(D)) to pick up the wafer. The wafer was sitting on susceptor 21 at the time (was "fastened" on the susceptor), so there was no indication that the friction between the wafer and the susceptor would allow the wafer to rotate. Therefore, Hiuga does not provide a motivation to make Tokmulin's pins 17 rotatable.

The undersigned also pointed out that the office action, page 6, second paragraph, stated that the motivation was "to prevent the article from sticking to the pins". However, the references do not teach or suggest that their wafers stuck to the pins, or that sticking to the pins would present a problem even if present.

The undersigned further stated that the invention was directed to rotating a flying, unstable wafer (held in position by gas) around an axis passing through the wafer in the presence of two other rotations. This is not a simple problem.

The examiners indicated that they would thoroughly consider such arguments in a response to the office action, possibly making another prior art search.

Any questions regarding this case can be addressed to the undersigned at the telephone number below.

**EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:**  
**EV 861 968 917 US**

Respectfully submitted,

*Michael Shenker*

Michael Shenker  
Patent Attorney  
Reg. No. 34,250  
Telephone: (408) 392-9250, Ext. 212

Law Offices Of  
MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP  
1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226  
San Jose, CA 95110